Previous referen

1907-8

(Sep: Rev

File No. 574—02

Serial Nos. 1—4

Later references.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1—4

Part B. for May 08

SUBJECT.

Inamdar's claim to the toddy revenue of Jodi Gollahalli village, Devanahalli Taluk

---

1) From the Excise Commr No-4965/333 & 26.2.08 Submits with his opinion, the record of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of Jodi Gollahalli village, Devanahalli Tq

2) To the Excise Commr No 158 (Ex 7.16 & 20.8.08

Points out certain defect in the enquiry of the case and requests him to furnish additional information on certain points

G. R. S. 58

3) From the Excise Commr No. 8841/3 16.4.08 Resubmits the case with the additional information called for, & states that [illegible]

Inamdar is not entitled to toddy excise revenue of the village

4) To the Excise Comm^{r} & Comptroller

No. 70. 5961-2-93.5.08

It is alleged the Inamdars claim

G.R.S. 11] 1907-08

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT

(Sep Rev)

NOTES.

File. No. 54-02

FILE HEADING.

Inamdar's claim for the toddy revenue of Jodi Gollalli village, Devanhalli Taluk.

From

The Excise Commr

No. 4965/333 Dated 26.2.03 Received 27.2.03.

Diary No. 342	Enclos.	Spare Copies.	Serial No.

BRIEF ABSTRACT OF LETTER.

Submits, with his opinion, the record of enquiry relating to the toddy revenue of Jodi Gollalli village Devanhalli Tk.

~~NOTES AND ORDERS.~~

2. To the Excise Commr no 1584/4163-38 dt 6/3/03

Points out certain defects in the enquiry of the case and requests him to furnish additional information on certain points.

please see draft

NOTES—First sheet.

GPB—30,000—20-3-06.

G. R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

S. R. File No. 54 of 1902-03

Serial No.	
3	From the Excise Commissioner No. 8841 S 16.4.08 Submits the records relating to the Inamdar's claim to the Excise revenue and states that under the circumstances represented he concurs in the opinion of the Dy Comr and the investigating Offr that the Inamdar is not entitled to the Excise toddy revenue of the village. The village has been built no doubt the Inamdar or Inamdars does not conceal toddy revenue to the members of the Inam Settlement Conducted in 1875 has reserved "arkani" to govt. Though toddy is included among the items of revenue enjoyed by the Inamdars the Inamdars do not claim the toddy excise revenue, but they claim only trees upon which there is no objection. Submitted with the draft records Note The Collector

Note.—Contn sheet.

GPB—50,00017—3-07

G.R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 54 of 1902

Serial No.

of Gutta Chits / proceeds the Ryotwars seem liable to Stamp duty & penalty under the Stamp Law. As the Ryotwars had the liberty to make their own arrangements with the licensees from 1897-98 & as the grove was not assigned to any Ryot, they were not entitled to any account under rules 8 & 17 one point to note: What would be the case - The grove in this & 4 other villages were not independently sold during the years 1892-93 & 94-95. The total amount realized has been apportioned amongst the several villages sold together The date upon which this apportionment is made are not clear

Forwarded to Branch III for favour of a note as to whether the Gutta Chits granted in this case are liable to Stamp duty or not.

29.4.04

Sd. for orders with a copy of the Stamp Rep

Jewis 1480

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GHB-50,00017—3-07

3964

G&R. S. 12]
General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 54 of 1902

Serial No.

The four documents referred to, under which the trees of the village are leased out for a period of one year ~~do~~ in each case, do seem to require to be stamped under art: 33 of the Stamp Regulation The exemption under that article applies only to the case of a cultivator, that is, a person who actually cultivates the soil and not to a farmer (Vide Jagannatha Iyer's Stamp Act. notes under the Article relating to leases) In the document of the year Sarvajithu, there is a condition that for a ~~amount~~ sum of Rs 5, a portion of the rent, toddy seeds would be purchased and planted and trees grown. This is not sufficient however to bring the document under the exemption.

Br II) 2.5.08 JLW

Sd/- The article in the Schedule is significant that the exemption applies only to a cultivator & Hence

the 4.5.08 The suits should be stamped. Draft

JLW

NOTE—Contn sheet.

GPB-50,000174-3-07

No 4965 Rec 1 file
333

Excise Commissioner's Office
Bangalore, dated 24th February 18
26th

From

P. R. Purnaiya Esqr.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

To

H. V. Ranjundiah Esqr.
Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Department

Sir,

In submitting herewith the records of enquiry relating to the Toddy Revenue of Jodi Gollahulli village, Devanhully taluk, I have the honor to state that I concur in the investigating officer's findings that the Jodidar is not entitled to Excise Revenue from Toddy. Neither the Sammud of the village nor the Inam Settlement has conceded Excise Revenue from Toddy. The Mutchalikas produced by the

Jodidar

E 4342

27 FEB 1903

94 of 1903

From P. N. Purnaya Esqr.
Excise Commissioner
in Mysore

S.R. 54-02-1.

To H. V. Ranjundiah Esqr.
Secretary to Government
General & Revenue Department

Dated 24th February 1903

Despatched 26

Received

General No. 4965

No. 338

Enclosure No. 1 file

Submits, with his opinion, the records of enquiry relating to the Toddy Renewal of Jadi Gollahully village, Devanhully taluk.

Excise
27.2.03

Devarkally Taluk.		Name of Taluk
Budgere Hobly		Name of Hobli Sanmak or Nagani
Jodi Sollahally village.		Name of Sarvamanya Jodi or Kayamberra village
Jodidars (1) Venkatramaiah (2) Sirappa		Name or Names of Jodidars or Kayamberrars
Jaindars Engaging Witness Nimpa of 1815.		Documents relied upon
Nil		Witnesses Examined
Inamdars are not entitled to Jodi Revenue but to 1/5th of the Government rent up to the year 1896-97 inclusive and to enjoy free rent for the succeeding years.		Finding

Rs Calculation of a claim to Jodi Inam

Area of land Claimed

3 Acres

ree Enquired into by Mr Kennaramichael Sy

n cassem Deemsbore district.

	Amount awarded if any	Grounds of decision
	The amount required for the years 92-93 and 93-94 was for a certain of the Expenditure as follows:- 1892-93 = 182-- 93-94 = 132-- 94-95 = 132-- 95-96 = 48-- 96-97 = 48-- The amount to be awarded by Government is three fifths of the valuation of 692: 492 -- " viz: Rs. 98.6.0	(1) Use of a right of way enjoyed but how that had by Ramasamy was exercised by the Grandsons (2) Owing to grant of free revenue by Government to the Grandsons, it is clear that he is entitled to some of the amount as Revenue found by the Kamma as Revenue found

Collector

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness

the Maharaja of Mysore.

Sh 54-02 8(2)

Read:--

The marginnaly noted letters from the Excise Commissio

er in Mysore submitting the records of enquiring into the claims

to excise revenue of the Inams noted in the Margin.

Letter No.5662/364 on the Inamdar's claim to toddy Revenue of Giddanhalli village, Anekal Taluk.
Letter No.6995/469 on the Inamdar's claim to toddy revenue ofGavipalya village, Nelamangala Taluk.
~~xxxxx~~
Letter No.4968/336 -do- -do- Aradesahalli, Devanhalli taluk.
Letter No.4965/339 -do- -do- Golhalli, Devanhalli Taluk.
Letter No.5001/339 -do- -do- Arasanahalli, Reddanahalli, -do- Taluk.
Letter No.5451/359 -do- -do- Mahanatalingapura, Anekal Taluk.
Letter No.5499/357 -do- -do- Itagalpura, Doddaballapur Taluk.
Letter No.5496/354 -do- -do- Chakanahalli, -do- -do-
Letter No.5663/365 -do- -do- Kamasandara, Aekal Taluk.

Order thereon No.158/Ex.F.16-01

Dated, Bangalore, ~~April 1908.~~ 26/8/03

In every case read above the investigating officer, Mr B.J. Kumarasami Naik, B.A., records the findings that the claimants are entitled to $\frac{1}{5}$ oftree-rent up to 98-99 and they are entitled to full tree rent for the succeeding years.

2. Government regret to observe that the decision is incorrect and the enquiry is incomplete. The first portion of the decision ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ being under rule 4 of Government Proceeding No.2074-83/R.F.166-92-1, dated the 2nd August 1901, of Grove Form rent towards tree rent up to 96-97 alone ought to have been awarded.

3. The needful information for the second finding of the investigating officer which falls under rules 8 and 17 of the Proceeding quoted above, was not before him; and hence it is a decision baced on no evidence.

4. The Excise Commissioner states he concurs with the investigating officer; but awards 1/5 of Gorve Farm rent only under rule 4 without noticing the other finding of the latter.

5. The decision and the enquiry being thus defective, Government direct that the records of enquiry be remitted to the investigating officer for completing the enquiry and for recording a correct and full decision.

Sd/ H. V Nanjundayya

~~For~~ Secretary to Government.

To

The Excise Commissioner in Mysore

M. V.

D. 3964. 516

II 420/14

Office of the Excise Commissioner
in Mysore,

No. 8841
Two enclosures & 1 file

Dated Bangalore, 16th April 1908.

SR 54-02-3.

54-02

From

F.H. Sparkes Esquire,
Excise Commissioner, in Mysore.

To

C.S. Balasundram Iyer Esquire, B.A.,
Offg. Secretary to the Government of
His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore,
General & Revenue Departments.

Sir,

1. Letter No. A. 203 dated 27.12.07 from the Deputy Comm^r Bangalore District
2. Letter No. 1146 dated 23.4.07 from the Senior Asst Com^r Doddaballapur Sub-Division to the Deputy Comm^r Bangalore District.

I have the honor to submit herewith the marginally noted correspondence and the records of investigation relating to the Inamdar"s claim to the Excise Revenue from toddy of Sarvamanya Gollahalli village in the Devanhalli Taluk and to state that the village has only a date grove but no toddy shop. The Nirup dated 1815 alienating the village does not concede the item of toddy Excise to the Inamdar and at the Inam settlement which was conduc-ed in the year 1875, all rights to Abkari have been reserved to Government.

2. The marginally noted gutta chits produced by the Inamdar only show that he was receiving tree-rent for the trees he was leasing out to the Government contractors. In fact one of the Inamdars, B.Subbanna disclaims any right to the toddy Excise revenue of the village. in these circumstances I concur in the findings of the investigating officer and the opinion recorded by the --- Deputy Commissioner that the Inamdar is not entitled to the Excise Revenue from toddy of the village.

1. GuttaChit dated 9-8-85 executed by Narasappa of Kundana.
2. ----do-------20-9-86
------do-------do-----
3. ----do-----by Boodigere Nagappa and KundanaNarasappa
4. ----do----of Venkataboyee of Krishnaragapura.

3. The payment to be made to the Inamdar will be regulated b

by rules 4,8 and 16 contained in Government order No. 2074,-83-R.A 166-92 dated 2nd. August 1901 and a refund bill for the amount --- payable to the Inamdar will be submitted on receipt of the orders of Government on the claim. The excess amount paid to the Inamdar referred to in the 4th. para of the Senior Assistant Commissioner's letter will also be recovered.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient Servant,

for Excise Commissioner

8

Bangalore District.

Deputy Commissioner's Office,

Dated. 26/27th December 1907.

From,

D. Devaraj Urs Esquire.,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

To,

H. H. Sparkes, Esquire,

Excise Commissioner in Mysore.

Sir

With reference to your letter No. 98, dated 19/21st September 1905, returning certain files of records relating to the enquiry into the toddy claims, I have the honor to retransmit herewith the files of the marginally noted villages received with the Dodballapur Sub Division, Assistant Commissioner's letter No. 1146, dated 23rd April 1907 (copy of which is enclosed) and to state as follows:-

1 Ganyakya - Melamaryhalli, Dabk
2 Chikkamakalli } Doddaballapur Dabk
3 Hatalpura - }
4 Ardesahalli } Devanhalli Dabk
5 Arsanahalli }
Peddanahalli }
6 Gollahalli }

The amounts due to the Inamdars of the several villages quoted above under Rule 4 of Government Proceedings No. 2074-83/R.F.166-9, dated 2nd August 1907, are recorded in the revised calendars of each case submitted by Mr. Kumaraswami Naick.

2. It would appear from the records that these Inamdars have been allowed to lease out and the toddy trees themselves subsequent to 1896-97, and as such they are not entitled to get anything on account of rent during the year 1897-98 in which preliminary tree tax system was introduced and the subsequent years in which the tree tax system was brought into force

3. The groves of the Inam villages of Ardesahalli Arsanahalli, Peddanahalli and Gollahalli in the Devanhalli

Taluk

Taluk and Gavepalya in the Nelamangala Taluk were not sold independently but sold clubbed together with other villages from 1892-93 to 1894-95. Thus the amounts awarded for these years in the calenders of these villages appear to have been arrived at by the ~~appointment~~ apportionment of the grove farms rent among the villages whose groves were sold together. The other files of records relating to the villages of Giddenahalli, Hantalingapura and Komasundra referred to in the letter under reference will be submitted soon after their receipt from the Assistant Commissioner, Bangalore Sub Division.

I have the honor to be etc.,

(Sd) D. Devaraj Urs,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

" C O P Y."

for Excise Commissioner,

in Mysore.

From,

K. R. Sreenevasiengar Esquire,

Senior Assistant Commissioner,

Dodballapur.

To,

H. F. Sparkes, Esquire,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

Dated 18th April 1907.

No. 1146.

Sir,

With reference to your memo No. 127, dated 18th October 1906, forwarding for further enquiry the papers relating to the claims of toddy revenue of the Inamdars of the marginally noted villages, I have the honor to report as follows:-

1. Gonipalya, Nelamangala Taluk
2. Chikkahalli
3. Alajalpura, Doddaballapur Taluk
4. Ardesahalli
5. Arasanahalli, Reddahalli
6. Gallahalli, Devanhally Taluk

From the enquiry held by my predecessors, it is clear that the Inamdars of none of the 6 villages in question are ~~liable~~ entitled to the toddy revenue of these villages. The only question for determination is the amount of refund to which these Inamdars may be entitled under Rules 4, 8 and 17 of the Rules published in Government Order No. 2074-83/R.F. 166-92, dated 2nd August 1901.

2. As regards the claims of the Inamdars for 1/5 of the grove farm rent under rule 4, the revised calendars of each case submitted by Mr. Kumaraswami Naick give the grove farm rents in the villages in question realized during the years 1892-93 to 1896-97 and the 1/5 portion thereof refundable to the Inamdars. I am unable to make out where from the figures given in the calendars for the grove farm rentals during the

above

above five years were obtained. I see that these figures differ slightly from those furnished to me by the Amildars to whom I made a reference in the matter. I may also add that I have not been able to obtain from the District office full information regarding the grove farm rentals realized during the five years in question.

3. As regards the claims under Rules 8 and 17 notices were issued to the Inamdars and such of them as appeared were heard in support of their claims; none of them could give definite and accurate information which would entitle them to any refund of tree rent. It is ascertained from Deputy Commissioner's yadi No. 158, dated 9th November 1906, and also from the reports of the Amildars that from the years 1897-98 the date trees in the Inam villages in question were leased out by the Inamdars themselves and that Government did not place any restriction on their so leasing out the trees or recover any tree rent from trees leased out in these villages. Hence no refund is due to the Inamdars of these villages towards tree rent under Rules 16 and 17 either for the year 1897-98 when the preliminary tree tax system was brought into force or during the subsequent years when the tree tax system was fully into operation.

4. I desire to invite your attention to the statement submitted by the Amildar of Devanhalli wherefrom it is seen that a sum of Rs. 350-3-8 has already been advanced to the Inamdars of Gollahalli though the amount refundable to him under rule 4 amounts to only Rs. 98-6-5.

5. The records received with the reo under report as also the records of further enquiries held in this office are herewith submitted as per/erist.

I have the honor to be etc.
(Sd) Thumboo Chetty,
for Senior Assistant Commissioner,
Dodballapur Division.

" C O P Y."

(Sd) D. Devaraj Urs,

Deputy Commissioner,

Bangalore District.

C O P Y."

for Excise Commissioner,

in Mysore.

G.R.S. 28]

File No. 54/02
Serial No. 4

Diary No. of letter replied to 3964

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore.

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.
(84)

, the 190

Date of issue 13th May/08

Signed by [illegible]

READ— Correspondence regarding letter No 884/B 66/4/08 from the Excise Comr. submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim to the Govt. revenue of Gollahalli village Devanahalli Taluk Bangalore Dt

ORDER THEREON.—No.

Order thereon No FE 5961-2 dt 13 May/08
Fee village leave

over

SUBJECT

GPB—10,000—10-4-06

Stores Land No 6083
Rules. The Revenue
Authorities the Village
Officers not Concede the
Legitimate Requests of
the Peace Settlement
Concluded in 1875
has Preserved in Tact
the Inhabitants are
Admitted & entitled
to [illegible].
Nothing more than
Free rent for 1/5 of the
Stores Farm rent for
the Years 1892-93 to 1896-97
under Receipt & Counter
Sig. No 2074-83-Rt 166-92
dt 7/8/07

The Guttia Chiefs Produced
by the Inhabitants are
liable to duty and penalty
under the Stamps Law
of the Government, Bangalore
will be requested to
take needful action
for the recovery of the duty and penalty

Proceedings of the Government of His Highness the Maharaja of Mysore, Financial (Separate Revenue), dated 13th May 1908.

READ—

Correspondence ending with letter No. 884, dated 16th April 1908, from the Excise Commissioner, submitting the record of enquiry relating to the claim to the toddy revenue of Gollahalli village, Devanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District.

No. FL. 5961-2—S. R. 54-02-4, DATED BANGALORE, 13TH MAY 1908.

ORDER THEREON.—The village has a grove but no toddy shop. The Nirup alienating the village does not concede the toddy excise revenue and the Inam Settlement conducted in 1875 has reserved it to Government. The Inamdars are admittedly entitled to nothing more than tree-rent or $\frac{1}{8}$th of the grove farm rent for the years 1892-93 to 1896-97 under Rule 4 contained in Government Order No. 2074-83—R.F. 166-92, dated 2nd August 1901.

The gutta chits produced by the Inamdars are liable to duty and penalty under the Stamp Law. The Deputy Commissioner, Bangalore, will be requested to take needful action for the recovery of the duty and penalty in the matter.

C. S. BALASUNDARAM IYER,
Offg. Secy. to Govt., Gen. & Rev. Depts.

To—The Excise Commissioner in Mysore, returning the records.
The Comptroller, Mysore Government.

Exd.—C. P. S.

1907-08

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE

FINANCIAL.
(SEPARATE REVENUE)

PROCEEDINGS

Dated 13th May 1908

No. Fl. 5961-2 / S. R. 54-02-4

Disallowing the Inamdar's claim to the Toddy Excise Revenue of Golhalli village, Devanhalli Taluk, Bangalore District.

GPB—25-5-08—200